

Remarks

Claims 1-15 and 17-32 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 5-7, 15, 17, 19, 20, 29, 30, and 32 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for a computer program product recited in claim 15. Applicants submit that the specification describes the computer program product recited in claim 15. For example, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 5, line 31, through page 6, line 10; and page 18, line 15, through page 20, line 18. These passages clearly describe a computer program product. It is not necessary that the specification verbatim describe an invention as recited in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims recite statutory subject matter. Along these lines, claim 15 recites a computer readable medium. Additionally, claim 17 recites storage systems. Therefore, claims 15 and 17 and claims 18-32, which depend from claim 17, recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,636,875 to Bashant in view of applicants'

admitted prior art (AAPA). The Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 8-10, 20, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of AAPA and further in view of DeVos et al. The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of AAPA and further in view of U.S. patent 6,564,201 to Hamsa.

The combination of Bashant and AAPA does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 15 or 17 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest adding a new object and data related to the new object into a first system, requesting data relating to a target object included in one of the systems, identifying relevant systems including data relating to the target object, and retrieving the data regarding the target object from identified relevant systems. Bashant only suggests adding data of known types of object, such as claims, billing, and web sales. Additionally, Bashant relates to synchronizing related data storage elements in disparate storage systems. The same data is replicated among the storage systems, as described at col. 1, lines 17-29.

On the other hand, the claimed invention can deal with data that is not the same and that originates in different elements of an electric power network. The claimed invention can add new objects, such as additional elements of an electric power network. As such, the claimed invention can request data relating to a target object included in one of the systems, identifying relevant systems including data relating to the target object, and retrieving the data regarding the target object from identified relevant systems. While the data may relate to similar elements, such as transformers, the data need not be identical, such as customer data that is replicated among the different modules suggested by Bashant. Bashant only suggests the same

data in different storage systems and synchronizing the data.

AAPA does not overcome the shortcomings of Bashant. In fact, the inadequacies of AAPA are discussed at page 3, line 23, through page 4, line 6, of the specification. The claimed invention addresses these shortcomings.

The combination of Bashant, AAPA and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 3-5, 8-10, 20, and 24-26 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest adding a new object and data related to the new object into a first system, requesting data relating to a target object included in one of the systems, identifying relevant systems including data relating to the target object, and retrieving the data regarding the target object from identified relevant systems. The Examiner only cites DeVos et al. as suggesting mapping using a model based on a CIM/XML document, which does not suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant and AAPA. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, AAPA and DeVos et al. and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant, AAPA and Hamsa does not suggest the invention recited in claim 11 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest adding a new object and data related to the new object into a first system, requesting data relating to a target object included in one of the systems, identifying relevant systems including data relating to the target object, and retrieving the data regarding the target object from identified relevant systems. The Examiner only cites Hamsa as suggesting object integration based on a template, which does not

suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant and AAPA.

Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, AAPA and Hamsa and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300